

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

MARCIA WEINGARTEN AND
TOM CLARK, on behalf of themselves and all
others similarly situated in New Mexico,

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 07-CV-00218 MCA/WDS

vs.

AU OPTRONICS CORP.; AU OPTRONICS CORP.
AMERICA; CHI MEI OPTOELECTRONICS CO.,
LTD.; CHI MEI OPTOELECTRONICS USA, INC.;
CHUNGHWA PICTURE TUBES, LTD.; FUJITSU
LIMITED, INC.; FUJITSU AMERICA, INC.;
HANNSTAR DISPLAY CORPORATION;
HITACHI, LTD.; HITACHI DISPLAYS, LTD.;
HITACHI AMERICA, LTD.; IDTECH CO., LTD.;
IDTECH USA, INC.; IPS ALPHA TECHNOLOGY,
LTD.; LG.PHILIPS LCD CO., LTD.; LG.PHILIPS
LCD AMERICA, INC.; MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC
INDUSTRIAL CO. LTD.; PANASONIC
CORPORATION OF NORTH AMERICA;
MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC CORPORATION;
MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC & ELECTRONICS USA,
INC.; NEC ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.; NEC
LCD TECHNOLOGIES, LTD.; SAMSUNG
ELECTRONICS COMPANY LTD.; SAMSUNG
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.; SANYO
ELECTRIC CO. LTD.; SANYO NORTH AMERICA
CORPORATION; EPSON IMAGING DEVICES
CORPORATION; SEIKO EPSON CORPORATION;
EPSON AMERICA, INC.; EPSON ELECTRONICS
AMERICA, INC.; SHARP CORPORATION;
SHARP ELECTRONICS CORPORATION; S-LCD
CORPORATION; SYNTAX-BRILLIAN CORP.;
TOSHIBA CORPORATION; TOSHIBA
AMERICA, INC., TOSHIBA MATSUSHITA
DISPLAY TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD., and JOHN
DOES 1-100,

Defendants.

**JOINT MOTION FOR APPROVAL
OF STIPULATION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME**

**JOINT MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF STIPULATION FOR EXTENSION OF
TIME**

Plaintiffs Marcia Weingarten and Tom Clark and Defendants AU Optronics Corporation America; Chi Mei Optoelectronics U.S.A., Inc.; Epson America, Inc.; Epson Electronics America, Inc.; Hitachi America, Ltd.; LG.Philips LCD America, Inc.; Mitsubishi Electric & Electronics USA, Inc.; NEC Electronics America, Inc.; Panasonic Corporation of North America; Samsung Electronics America, Inc.; SANYO North America Corporation; and Sharp Electronics Corporation (the “Moving Defendants”) through their respective attorneys, jointly submit for the Court’s approval the following Stipulation for Extension of Time:

WHEREAS Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Complaint in the above-captioned case on or about March 21, 2007;

WHEREAS Plaintiffs allege antitrust violations by manufacturers of Liquid Crystal Display (“LCD”) products;

WHEREAS more than one hundred and twenty complaints have been filed to date in federal district courts throughout the United States by plaintiffs purporting to bring class actions on behalf of direct and indirect purchasers alleging antitrust violations by manufacturers of LCD products (collectively, “ the LCD Cases”);

WHEREAS there is a motion pending before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to transfer the LCD Cases for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407;

WHEREAS Plaintiffs anticipate the possibility of Consolidated Amended Complaints in the LCD Cases;

WHEREAS Plaintiffs and the Moving Defendants have agreed that an orderly schedule for any response to the pleadings in the LCD Cases would be more efficient for the parties and for the Court;

WHEREAS Plaintiffs agree that the deadline for the Moving Defendants to respond to the First Amended Complaint shall be extended until the earliest of the following dates: (1) forty-five days after the filing of a Consolidated Amended Complaint in the LCD Cases; (2) forty-five days after Plaintiffs provide a written notice to the Moving Defendants that they do not intend to file a Consolidated Amended Complaint, provided that such notice may be given only after the initial case management conference in the MDL transferee court in this case; or (3) as ordered by the MDL transferee court;

WHEREAS Plaintiffs and the Moving Defendants agree that notwithstanding the above paragraphs, should any defendant to whom this extension applies, except pursuant to Court Order, respond to any complaint in another LCD Case prior to the date contemplated by this Stipulation, then such defendant shall make a simultaneous response to the First Amended Complaint in the above-captioned matter;

WHEREAS Plaintiffs further agree that this extension is available, without further stipulation with counsel for Plaintiffs, to all named defendants who notify Plaintiffs in writing of their intention to join this extension and who file a motion with the Court seeking such extension on the same terms as set forth in this motion;

WHEREAS Plaintiffs, the Moving Defendants, and any other named defendants who subsequently file a motion to obtain the benefit of this extension pursuant to the preceding paragraph agree that such defendant shall not contest the sufficiency of process or service of process. This Stipulation does not constitute a waiver of any other defense, including but not limited to the defenses of lack of personal or subject matter jurisdiction or improper venue.

PLAINTIFFS AND THE MOVING DEFENDANTS, BY AND THROUGH THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNSEL OF RECORD, HEREBY STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS:

1. The deadline for the Moving Defendants to respond to the First Amended Complaint shall be extended until the earliest of the following dates: (1) forty-five days after the filing of a Consolidated Amended Complaint in the LCD Cases; (2) forty-five days after Plaintiffs provide a written notice to the Moving Defendants that they do not intend to file a Consolidated Amended Complaint, provided that such notice may be given only after the initial case management conference in the MDL transferee court in this case; or (3) as ordered by the MDL transferee court.
2. This extension is available, without further stipulation with counsel for Plaintiffs, to all named defendants who notify Plaintiffs in writing of their intention to join this extension and who file a motion with the Court seeking such extension on the same terms as set forth in this motion.
3. Plaintiffs, the Moving Defendants, and any other named defendants that provide notice of their intention to join this extension pursuant to the preceding paragraph agree that such defendant shall not contest the sufficiency of process or service of process. This Stipulation does not constitute a waiver of any other defense, including but not limited to the defenses of lack of personal or subject matter jurisdiction or improper venue.
4. Plaintiffs, the Moving Defendants, and any other named defendants joining this extension pursuant to paragraph 2 agree that notwithstanding the above paragraphs, should any defendant to whom this extension applies, except pursuant to Court Order, respond to any complaint in another LCD Case prior to the date contemplated by this Stipulation, then such defendant shall make a simultaneous response to the First Amended Complaint in the above-captioned matter.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated this 30 day of March, 2007.

FREEDMAN, BOYD, DANIELS, HOLLANDER,
GOLDBERG & IVES, P.A.

By: telephonically approved
David A. Freedman
20 First Plaza NW, Suite 700
Post Office Box 25326
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87125-0326
(505) 842-9960

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

SHEEHAN, SHEEHAN & STELZNER, P.A.

By: telephonically approved
Luis G. Stelzner
707 Broadway NE, Suite 300
Post Office Box 271
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103
(505) 247-0411

Attorneys for Defendant LG.Philips
LCD America, Inc.

MODRALL, SPERLING, ROEHL, HARRIS
& SISK, P.A.

By: s/Zachary McCormick
John R. Cooney
Zachary L. McCormick

Attorneys for AU Optronics Corporation
America; Chi Mei Optoelectronics U.S.A., Inc.;
Epson America, Inc.; Epson Electronics
America, Inc.; Hitachi America, Ltd.;
Mitsubishi Electric & Electronics USA, Inc.;
NEC Electronics America, Inc.; Panasonic
Corporation of North America; Samsung
Electronics America, Inc.; SANYO North
America Corporation; and Sharp Electronics
Corporation
Post Office Box 2168
Bank of America Centre
500 Fourth Street NW, Suite 1000
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103-2168
Telephone: 505.848.1800

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

WE HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 30th day of March, 2007, we filed the foregoing electronically through the CM/ECF system, which caused the following parties or counsel to be served by electronic means, as more fully reflected on the Notice of Electronic Filing:

- **David A. Freedman**
daf@fbdlaw.com,daf@fbdlaw.com,ks@fbdlaw.com,rpm@fbdlaw.com
- **Matthew L. Garcia**
mlg@fbdlaw.com,rh@fbdlaw.com
- **Kevin J O'Connor**
koconnor@gklaw.com

AND WE FURTHER CERTIFY that on such date a copy of the foregoing was served via first-class mail, postage prepaid, addressed as follows to:

Timothy D Battin
Straus & Boies LLP
4041 University Drive
5th Floor
Fairfax, VA 22030

David Boies, III
Straus & Boies LLP
4041 University Drive
5th Floor
Fairfax, VA 22030

Nathan Cihlar
Straus & Boies LLP
4041 University Drive
5th Floor
Fairfax, VA 22030

Ian Otto
Straus & Boies LLP
4041 University Drive
5th Floor
Fairfax, VA 22030

MODRALL SPERLING ROEHL
HARRIS & SISK, P.A.

By /s/ Zachary L. McCormick
Zachary L. McCormick